

**SPF/SIG Grant Review Workgroup**  
**Minutes**  
**April 23rd, 2007**  
**DMHA Conference Room**  
**9:00 AM to 12:00 Noon**

**Attendance:** (Voting) Jeff Barber, Terry Jenkins, Carolyn Waller, David Bozell, Sonya Cleveland, Joshua Ross, Karla Sneegas  
(Non-Voting) Eric Wright, Harold Kooreman, Tonia Smith, Mary Lay, Marcia French and Kim Manlove

**Review Process Indiana SPF SIG applications:** All members were in attendance with the exception of Paula Parker-Sawyers who was unable to participate due to illness and could not score the applications assigned to her. The Workgroup agreed to distribute four of the un-scored applications to members who had not previously scored them as a primary or secondary reviewer. The two remaining proposals were given to John Viernes to score. The review of applications began with all members reporting their scores which were added to a spreadsheet, totaled and an average score calculated. Discussion of applications that only had one score was deferred until Wednesday April 25<sup>th</sup> when the GRW will reconvene.

Governors Advisory Council Vice-Chair Jason Hutchens was apprised of the change in the review process.

**Application Discussion and Comments:** *(In order to maintain confidentiality in the review process only the assigned application number will be used in these minutes).*

**Applications #1 and #2:**

One application was missing a budget attachment.

*Proposals where from the same agency and appeared to be essentially the same document cut and pasted together.*

Proposal described more of what the organization is doing now rather than what they planned to do with SPF SIG funding.

Lack of university involvement was a negative.

**Application # 4**

Proposal appeared vague and lacked depth.

Described the community need but not how it would be addressed.

Concern noted on that lack of a plan for sustainability and capacity.

Proposal was light on financial information.

**Application #10**

Proposal failed to focus on the alcohol priority, how it affected the community and link data to the area of concern. Did not bring the data to bear to adequately address how they would effect community change.

Did not demonstrate how they would benefit from SPF SIG funding.

Did not demonstrate a strong link to or partnership with the university community in county.

**Application #24**

Proposal was well written but there were errors in the financial information and no the qualifications of their fiscal manager were lacking.

**Application #21**

Proposal is a poorly constructed application indicative of a High Need but Low capacity community.

Largest portion of budget is outsourcing to contractors with administration of project shared between four part timers.

*Application should significant need and is a strong example of a community that needs help with infrastructure development.*

If selected they will require significant assistance from DMHA, Community Consultants and the PRC.

It was suggested that if funded an updated action plan be required.

**The GRW voted unanimously to recommend Application 21 on the basis of it's High Need and Low Capacity.**

**Application #22**

Application exhibits a well developed coalition which appears high in capacity although many board members are out of the Chicago area.

Concern noted that portions of the organization are not locally driven.

Financial capacity and infrastructure appear strong.

Personnel costs are all in-state but questions remain about the budget for out of state travel.

**Application #23/24**

*Application was disappointing containing a lot of information about existing partnerships not what they expect to accomplish with SPF SIG funding.*

Proposals appeared to mirror images of one another.

The Epidemiological Report Data was the same for both Alcohol and Cocaine.

**Application #5**

Applicant demonstrated high need as well as very high capacity that could be brought to bear in service delivery.

Application was one of the most thorough.

**Application #8**

Application lacked a plan to check validity.

Narrowly focused target population

Applicant showed no evidence of a prevention background.

**Recommendations Governor's Advisory Council:**

The GRW will recommend funding High Need and Low Capacity applications. The final number will be determined at the next meeting.

The GRW will present two funding strategies one for 10 grantees and one for 12 grantees in the form of a resolution accompanied by fiscal impact data asking the GAC for

authorize DMHA to open contract negotiations. There will be no identifying information contained in the funding strategies other than application numbers.

Eric Wright will develop the funding strategies resolutions. Kim and Marcia will prepare a PowerPoint presentation for the GAC that will include background on the review process, the funding strategies and the resolutions.

April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 9:00 AM to 12:00 Noon (Location TBD)

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 Noon